

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the instant application is respectfully requested. The present amendment, submitted concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination, is responsive to the Office Action of July 31, 2006, in which claims 1-7, 9-14 and 16-19 are now presently pending. Of those, claims 1-7, 11-14, 18 and 19 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,598,144 to Bailey, et al. In addition, claims 9, 10, 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Bailey. For the following reasons, however, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance.

In the amendment filed on May 24, 2006, independent claims 1, 13, 18 and 19 were amended to more particularly point out and recite the presently disclosed resource address translation process through a resource address designation (RAD). In particular, resource address translation is a process by which a RAD is decomposed such that the address space of a memory-mapped adapter can be accessed. In contrast, the Applicants pointed out that Bailey discloses only conventional dynamic virtual-to-physical address translation schemes (i.e., based wholly on dynamic addressing associated with, for example, Intel-type processor architectures).

However, in the present Final Office Action, the Examiner has taken the position that the claimed resource address designation (RAD) is simply interpreted as “an address/location that is requested,” and that Bailey teaches this claimed feature. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 13, 18 and 19 are now amended to more particularly point out and recite specific features of the disclosed RAD. In particular, the RAD is comprised of a plurality of fields of varying bit sizes with respect to one another. Support for this amendment is found at least on pages 17-18 (paragraph 0056) of the specification. In addition, dependent claims 20-23 are newly added to further designate specific RAD fields, and the functions thereof, as also disclosed in pages 17-18 of the specification.


As will be appreciated, the claimed fields that make up a resource address designation are properly characterized as a compound set of heterogeneous components, as opposed to a homogeneous set of components of uniform bit size in a memory space. Since the Examiner has previously interpreted the term “resource address designation” in Bailey as an address/location that is requested, it will noted from an inspection of Bailey that the virtual address 42 (i.e., a requested address/location) is depicted as a value of uniform, 12-bit (1.5 byte) length contained within a 4kB page 40. (Bailey, col. 5, lines 2-5; col. 6, lines 6-12; Fig. 1). Although Bailey states (col. 7, lines 50-60) that the addressable range of the page 40 may be of a different size than 4kB (e.g., 4MB), there is still no teaching or disclosure therein that the virtual address 42 is comprised of a plurality of fields of varying byte size.

Therefore, since Bailey fails to teach or disclose the varying bit size fields of the claimed resource address designation, as well as the functions thereof, each of the outstanding §102 and §103 rejections of the pending claims have been overcome, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the same.

For the above stated reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. No new matter has been entered and no additional fees are believed to be required. However, if any fees are due with respect to this Amendment, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130 maintained by Applicants' attorneys.

Respectfully submitted,  
RICHARD K ERRICKSON, ET AL.

CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
Applicants' Attorneys

By   
Sean F. Sullivan  
Registration No. 38,328  
Customer No. 46429

Date: October 19, 2006  
Address: 55 Griffin Road South, Bloomfield, CT 06002  
Telephone: (860) 286-2929